

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Final Office Action dated November 12, 2008 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1, 4, 7-9, and 11-14 are hereby amended. No new matter was added. Claims 2-3 are hereby canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 1 and 4-17 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

The Office objects to the specification because of informalities. *Office Action* at ¶ 1. The specification has been amended to correct inadvertent clerical errors. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to the specification.

The Office objects to claim 13 because of informalities. *Office Action* at ¶ 2. Claim 13 has been amended to correct an inadvertent clerical error. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to claim 13.

The Office rejects claims 3-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. *Office Action* at ¶ 3-4. Applicant does not necessarily agree with the Office's conclusion, however, for the sake of expediting prosecution of the application to allowance, Applicant has canceled claim 3. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 3 is moot. Applicant has amended claim 4 to depend from independent claim 1. Thus, the Applicant respectfully believes the rejection is overcome and requests the Office to withdraw the rejection of claims 3-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

The Office rejects claims 3-4, 7-8, and 11-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for allegedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. *Office Action* at ¶ 5-11. Claim 3 is canceled herein, accordingly the rejection of this claim is moot. Claim 4 now depends from independent claim 1, thus obviating the rejection of claim 4. Applicant has amended claims 7-8, 11, and 13-14 to clarify the scope of the claims. Concerning claim 12, while not necessarily agreeing with the Office, but in a good faith effort to advance the prosecution of the application to allowance, Applicant amended claim 12 to remove the portion

of text that was unclear to the Examiner. Claim 12 was also amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 6. Claim 6 remains pending. Claims 15-17 depend directly or indirectly from claim 11. Applicant believes that the amendment to claim 11 overcomes the rejection of that claim, thus the rejections of claims 15-17 are likewise overcome. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the rejection of claims 3-4, 7-8, and 11-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The Office rejects claims 1-2, 5, and 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,779,430 to Thuruta *et al.* (Thuruta) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,351,974 to Lyu *et al.* (Lyu). Office Action at ¶¶ 12-14. Claim 2 is cancelled herein, accordingly the rejection of that claim is moot. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the remaining claims.

Applicant submits that *Thuruta* and *Lyu*, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest, at least, “rotating the pulsator for mixing the supplied first washing water and the detergent with the laundry; rotating the inner tub and a pulsator in the inner tub at a predetermined speed by a motor, to wash the laundry by a centrifugal force, and supplying a second washing water amount to an outer tub and an inner tub, wherein the second washing water amount is fixed according to an amount of the laundry that is sensed” as recited in independent claim 1.

The Office asserts that water supply (3) of step 216 in *Thuruta* corresponds to the Applicant’s “second washing water amount.” *Office Action* at p. 4-5. However, Applicant respectfully disagrees, as the water supply (3) is used, “for a second rinsing in step 216a...,” and not for washing. *Thuruta* at col. 6, ll. 14-34. (Emphasis added). Thus, *Thuruta* fails to teach or suggest, “rotating the pulsator for mixing the supplied first washing water and the detergent with the laundry... and supplying a second washing water amount ...,” as recited in independent claim 1. (Emphasis added).

Additionally, the Office reads *Thuruta*’s “stirring or agitating” on the claimed “rotating a pulsator.” *Office Action* at p. 5, line 5. However, Applicant respectfully disagrees. *Thuruta* does not in any way teach or suggest that “stirring or agitating” corresponds to rotating a pulsator. *Thuruta* teaches, at most, that, “the stirring or agitating (1) is very weak as compared to stirring or agitating for normal washing...” *Thuruta* at col. 5, l. 67-col. 6, l. 2. Thus, *Thuruta*

fails to teach or suggest anything concerning, “rotating the inner tub and a pulsator in the inner tub at a predetermined speed by a motor, to wash the laundry by a centrifugal force,” as recited in independent claim 1.

Lyu fails to cure the deficiencies of *Thuruta*. Indeed, *Lyu* is set forth by the Office for a showing of rotating a tub at a predetermined speed.” *Office Action* at p. 5, lines 9-13. However, nowhere does *Lyu* teach or suggest “rotating the pulsator for mixing the supplied first washing water and the detergent with the laundry... and supplying a second washing water amount ...,” as recited in independent claim 1. (Emphasis added).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over *Thuruta* in view of *Lyu*. It stands to reason that claims 5 and 7-9, which depend from independent claim 1, are also patentably distinguishable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Office to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-2, 5, and 7-9.

The Office rejects claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Thuruta* in view of *Lyu*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,826,932 to Sonoda *et al.* (*Sonoda*). *Office action* at ¶ 15. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent claim 6 is allowable at least because it depends from independent claim 1. Independent claim 1 recites, among other features, “rotating the pulsator for mixing the supplied first washing water and the detergent with the laundry...and supplying a second washing water amount to an outer tub and an inner tub, wherein the second washing water amount is fixed according to an amount of the laundry that is sensed.” *Thuruta*, *Lyu*, and *Sonoda* either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention.

As discussed above with regard to independent claim 1, *Thuruta* and *Lyu* fail to teach or suggest this feature. *Sonoda* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Thuruta* and *Lyu* with respect to this above recited feature. In fact, the Office cites *Sonoda* only for a purported disclosure of “stopping a motor.” *Office Action* at p. 8. However, nowhere does *Sonoda* teach or suggest the above recited feature of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 6 is patentably distinguishable over *Thuruta* in view of *Lyu*, and further in view of *Sonoda*, at least in

view of its ultimate dependency from independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Office to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 6.

The Office rejects claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Thuruta* in view of *Lyu*, and further in view of Japanese Patent Application No. 2003-10587 (*JP 2003-10587*). *Office action* at ¶ 16. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent claim 10 is allowable at least because it depends from independent claim 1. Independent claim 1 recites, among other features, “rotating the pulsator for mixing the supplied first washing water and the detergent with the laundry...and supplying a second washing water amount to an outer tub and an inner tub, wherein the second washing water amount is fixed according to an amount of the laundry that is sensed.” *Thuruta*, *Lyu*, and *JP 2003-10587* either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention.

As discussed above with regard to independent claim 1, *Thuruta* and *Lyu* fail to teach or suggest this feature. *JP 2003-10587* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Thuruta* and *Lyu* with respect to this above recited feature. In fact, the Office cites *JP 2003-10587* only for a purported disclosure of “rotating the pulsator includes the step of rotating the inner tub having no rotation force of the motor transmitted thereto together with the rotation of the pulsator in a direction opposite to the rotation direction of the pulsator ...” *Office Action* at p. 8-9. However, nowhere does *JP 2003-10587* teach or suggest the above recited feature of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 is patentably distinguishable over *Thuruta* in view of *Lyu*, and further in view of *JP 2003-10587*, at least in view of its dependency on independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Office to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 10.

The Office rejects claims 11 and 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Thuruta* in view of *Lyu*, and further in view of International Publication WO 03/080916 to *Park et al. (Park)*. *Office action* at ¶ 17. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The Office asserts that water supply (3) of step 216 in *Thuruta* corresponds to the Applicant’s “second washing water amount.” *Office Action* at p. 4-5. However, Applicant respectfully disagrees, as the water supply (3) is used, “for a second rinsing in step 216a...,” and

not for washing. *Thuruta* at col. 6, ll. 14-34. (Emphasis added). Thus, *Thuruta* fails to teach or suggest, “rotating the pulsator for mixing the supplied first washing water and the detergent with the laundry... and supplying a second washing water amount ...,” as recited in independent claim 1. (Emphasis added).

Additionally, the Office reads *Thuruta*’s “stirring or agitating” on the claimed “rotating a pulsator.” *Office Action* at p. 5, line 5. However, Applicant respectfully disagrees. *Thuruta* does not in any way teach or suggest that “stirring or agitating” corresponds to rotating a pulsator. *Thuruta* teaches, at most, that, “the stirring or agitating (1) is very weak as compared to stirring or agitating for normal washing...” *Thuruta* at col. 5, l. 67-col. 6, l. 2. Thus, *Thuruta* fails to teach or suggest anything concerning, “rotating the inner tub and a pulsator in the inner tub at a predetermined speed by a motor, to wash the laundry by a centrifugal force,” as recited in independent claim 1.

Lyu fails to cure the deficiencies of *Thuruta*. Indeed, *Lyu* is set forth by the Office for a purported showing of the pulsator having “to stop for a certain amount of time when there is a change of direction of rotations.” *Office Action* at p. 10 (*citing Lyu* at col. 5 ll. 34-35). However, nowhere does *Lyu* teach or suggest “supplying detergent, a first washing water amount, and a second washing water amount to an outer tub and an inner tub in the outer tub for holding laundry,” as recited in independent claim 11. (Emphasis added).

Park fails to cure the deficiencies of *Thuruta* and *Lyu*. Indeed, *Park* is set forth by the Office for a purported “step of soaking a supplied washing water and a detergent with a laundry.” *Office Action* at p. 11. However, nowhere does *Park* teach or suggest “supplying detergent, a first washing water amount, and a second washing water amount to an outer tub and an inner tub in the outer tub for holding laundry,” as recited in independent claim 11. (Emphasis added).

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 11 is patentably distinguishable over *Thuruta* in view *Lyu*, and in further view of *Park*. It stands to reason that claims 13-16, which depend from independent claim 11 also patentably distinguishable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Office to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 11 and 13-16.

The Office rejects claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Thuruta* in view of *Lyu*, and *Park*, and further in view of *Sonoda*. Office action at ¶ 18. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent claim 12 is allowable at least because it depends from independent claim 11. Independent claim 11 recites, among other features, “supplying detergent, a first washing water amount, and a second washing water amount to an outer tub and an inner tub in the outer tub for holding laundry [and] rotating the pulsator for mixing the supplied first washing water and the detergent with the laundry;..., and supplying a second washing water amount”

As discussed above with regard to independent claim 11, *Thuruta*, *Lyu*, and *Park* fail to teach or suggest at least these features. *Sonoda* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Thuruta*, *Lyu*, and *Park* with respect to this above recited features. In fact, the Office cites *Sonoda* only for a purported disclosure of “stopping a motor.” *Office Action* at p. 14. However, nowhere does *Sonoda* teach or suggest the above recited features of independent claim 11. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 12 is patentably distinguishable over *Thuruta*, *Lyu*, and *Park*, in view of *Sonoda*, at least because of its dependency from independent claim 11. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Office to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 12.

The Office rejects claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Thuruta* in view of *Lyu* and *Park*, and further in view of *JP 2003-10587*. Office Action at ¶ 19. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent claim 17 is allowable at least because it ultimately depends from independent claim 11. Independent claim 11 recites, among other features, “supplying detergent, a first washing water amount, and a second washing water amount to an outer tub and an inner tub in the outer tub for holding laundry... rotating a pulsator for mixing the supplied first washing water and the detergent with the laundry.” *Thuruta*, *Lyu*, *Park*, and *JP 2003-10587* either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention.

As discussed above with regard to independent claim 11, *Thuruta*, *Lyu*, and *Park* fail to teach or suggest this feature. *JP 2003-10587* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Thuruta*, *Lyu*, and *Park* with respect to this above recited feature. In fact, the Office cites *JP 2003-10587* only for a

purported disclosure of “rotating the pulsator includes the step of rotating the inner tub having no rotation force of the motor transmitted thereto together with the rotation of the pulsator in a direction opposite to the rotation direction of the pulsator ...” Office *Action* at p. 8-9. However, nowhere does *JP 2003-10587* teach or suggest the above recited features of claim 11, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 17 is patentably distinguishable over *Thuruta* in view of *Lyu*, and *Park*, and further in view of *JP 2003-10587*, at least in view of its dependency on independent claim 11. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Office to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 17.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance. Early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: February 12, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By /Michael I. Angert #46522/
Michael I. Angert
Registration No.: 46,522
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant